



S&H Form: (2/01)

Docket No.: 1293.1897

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Beom-ro Lee

Serial No. 10/677,530

Group Art Unit: 2854

Confirmation No. 2313

Filed: October 3, 2003

Examiner: Yan, Ren L.

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS OF CONTROLLING AN IMAGE INPUT AND A
RECORDING-MEDIUM SUPPLY OF AN IMAGE FORMING APPARATUS

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed July 2, 2004, having a shortened period for response set to expire on August 2, 2004, the following remarks are provided.

I. Provisional Election of Claims Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.142

Applicants provisionally elect **Group 1, claims 1-37 and 42-55** in response to the preliminary restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action.

II. Applicants Traverse the Requirement

Insofar as Group II is concerned, it is believed that claims 38-41 and 56 are so closely related to elected claims 1-37 and 42-55 that they should remain in the same application. There have been no references cited to show any necessity for requiring restriction and, in fact, it is believed that the Examiner would find references containing both method and product claims in the same field of technology. While it is noted that the Examiner has identified different classifications for the product and method claims, it is believed that classification is not conclusive on the question of restriction. Moreover, it is believed that evaluation of both sets of claims would not provide an undue burden upon the Examiner at this time in comparison with the additional expense and delay to Applicants in having to protect the additional subject matter recited by the Group II claims by filing a divisional application.

MPEP §803 sets forth the criteria for restriction between patentably distinct inventions.

(A) indicates that the inventions must be independent (see MPEP §802.01, §806.04, §808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP §806.05-806.05(i)); and (B) indicates that there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a)-§806.04(i), §808.01(a) and §808.02). The Examiner has not set forth why there would be a serious burden if restriction is required.

III. Conclusion

Upon review of references involved in this field of technology, when considering that the method and apparatus recited by the Group II claims have a separate utility, and elected Group I claims are related to Group II claims as subcombinations disclosed as usable in a single combination, and when all of the other various facts are taken into consideration, it is believed that upon reconsideration of the Examiner's initial restriction requirement, all of the pending claims should be examined in the subject application.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 19-3935.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7/29/04

By: 

Michael D. Stein
Registration No. 37,240

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Ste. 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 434-1500
(202) 434-1501